

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On May 10, 2007, Applicant's Representative, David Burns, conducted a telephone interview with Junior Examiner Sunit Pandya and supervisor Examiner Robert Pezzuto.

Base Claims 1, 22, 32, 46 and 49 were specifically discussed. It was agreed the free "gift" in Falciglia '002 that by chance appears in the mechanical windows in place of a call number is not the award representation found in Claims 1, 22, 32, 46 and 49. The Examiners also recognized the patentable difference between generating an end game result and generating an award representation (i.e. a winning bingo pattern does not inform a player of what the award is). Moreover, the Examiners recognized the patentable difference between generating a bingo card and generating common bingo call numbers.

However, Examiner Pezzuto took a broader view of the claim language than Examiner Pandya did in past prosecution, and thus presented a new grounds for rejection. Particularly, Examiner Pezzuto's concern centered on the following language generally found in all the base claims (emphasis added in bold):

"displaying an award representation of the end game result **through** a mechanical technological aid"

Examiner Pezzuto felt that the breadth of the mechanical technological aid could include its location anywhere in the play station, and merely does something to cause the award representation to be displayed even remote from the mechanical technological aid. Although a prior art reference was not provided that teaches such a mechanical aid, Examiner Pezzuto was confident such references are readily available if warranted.

It was agreed that Applicant would file an Amendment with an accompanied RCE to address this breadth of the claim language. It was also agreed that upon filing of this Amendment and RCE, a second Examiner Interview would be conducted prior to an Office Action.